REMARKS

The above patent application has been amended and reconsideration and reexamination are requested.

The examiner rejected Claims 1-7, 9-14, 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ritchey, U.S. Patent 5,495,576 in view of Dutta et al., U.S. Patent 6,453,294.

Claims 1-7, 9-14, 21 and 22 as amended are distinct over Ritchey in view of Dutta et al.

Claim 1 calls for a virtual reality presentation method. Included in claim 1 are the features of capturing motion of a user and capturing audio of the user. Claim 1 requires transforming the audio of the user to a different gender and animating a character with the motion and transformed audio of the different gender. Claim 1 also includes rendering the character animated with the captured motion of the user and talking with the transformed audio of the user on an output display device.

The combination of references does not suggest this combination of features. In particular, there is no suggestion of transforming the audio of the user into a different gender and animating a character with the motion and transformed audio of the different gender. Ritchey describes fundamental virtual reality processing. However, as recognized by the examiner Ritchey does not discuss any actions of transforming of user audio to a different gender. Dutta et al. while discussing transforming does so only in the context of an avatar for interactive communications between users such as using the avatar as an alias in a chat room. Dutta does not describe a virtual reality presentation. Dutta does not suggest that the avatar would render the captured motion of a user and captured audio of the user in the context of a virtual reality presentation.

Therefore, since neither reference suggest this specific combination of features, Claim 1 is allowable over the references. Moreover, there is no suggestion to make the proposed combination as set out by the examiner. Dutta relates to screen displays of Avatars whereas Ritchey relates to virtual reality processing. Neither the references themselves nor the general prior art provides any motivation to combine the references. As recognized by the examiner, Ritchey does not discuss transforming the audio of the user to a different gender and animating a

character with the motion and transformed audio of the different gender. Dutta on the other hand would not have any use for the virtual reality processing discussed in Ritchey, since Dutta is limited to avatar use for alias in the context of chat rooms and it would be distracting to capture motions of the use in the context of the avatar. Therefore, absent suggestion in the references to combine the teachings of the references, Claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 2-7, which depend on claim 1, claims 9-14, which share similar features of claims 1-7 and add the limitations of 3-dimensions are allowable over the references for at least the reasons discussed in claim 1. Claims 21 and 22 as amended are distinct over Ritchey in view of Dutta et al. for analogous reasons as in claim 1.

The examiner rejected Claims 23-30 and 32 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ritchey '576 in view of Yamamoto, U.S. Patent 5,923,337.

Claim 23 as currently amended, calls for a presentation method. Claim 23 also includes detecting motion of a user *** audio of the user and altering the audio of the user to change a gender of the audio. Claim 23 also requires synchronizing the motion of the user and the altered audio of the user to an animated character and rendering the character animated with the synchronized motion of the user and synchronized altered audio of the user on an output display device.

The combination of references does not suggest this combination of features. In particular, there is no suggestion of transforming the audio of the user into a different gender and animating a character with the motion and transformed audio of the different gender. Ritchey has the deficiencies as recognized by the examiner and discussed above. Ritchey does not provide any motivation for transforming audio of the user. Yamamoto while discussing correct for differences between male and female voices, there is not suggestion of transforming voices to different genders. Rather, it appears that the correction is the result or a need based on animation generation frame processing (See Yamamoto Col. 8 lines 1-14). Yamamoto also appears to do this only in the context of an animated character for interactive communications between users. Yamamoto does not describe a virtual reality presentation. Yamamoto does not suggest that the animated character would render the captured motion of a user and captured audio of the user in

the context of a virtual reality presentation. Rather, Yamamoto teaches the opposite, since Yamamoto teaches that the animated character expresses predetermined states of mind (See abstract)

Therefore, since neither reference suggest this specific combination of features, Claim 23 is allowable over the references. Moreover, there is no suggestion to make the proposed combination as set out by the examiner. Yamamoto relates to screen displays of animated characters whereas Ritchey relates to virtual reality processing. Neither the references themselves nor the general prior art provides any motivation to combine their respective teachings. As recognized by the examiner, Ritchey does not discuss transforming the audio of the user to a different gender and animating a character with the motion and transformed audio of the different gender. On the other hand, Yamamoto would not have any use for the virtual reality processing discussed in Ritchey, since Yamamoto is limited to an animated character that expresses predetermined states of mind. Any combination with Richey would be distracting to capture motions of the use in the context of the animated character. Therefore, absent suggestion in the references to combine the teachings of the references, Claim 23 and its dependent claims are allowable.

The examiner rejected Claim 31 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ritchey '576 in view of Yamamoto '337, and further in view of Doval et al., U.S. Patent 6,476,834.

Claim 31, which depends from claim 23 is allowable at least for the reasons discussed with respect to claim 23.

Enclosed is a $215 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11/17/04

Denis G. Maloney
Reg. No. 29,670

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

20977514.doc